

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, and reconsideration of the Office Action dated March 18, 2005. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-6, 10-14, 17-21, and 24-28 will remain pending in this application. The changes to the claims are supported by the specification and original claims. No new matter is incorporated by this Amendment.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 4-6, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 contain allowable subject matter. While these claims were objected to, the Examiner indicates they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the features of their base claim and any intervening claim. In response, claims 4, 13, 20, and 27 all have been rewritten as suggested by the Examiner. Hence, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 5 and 6 both ultimately depend from claim 4; claim 14 depends from claim 13; claim 21 depends from claim 20; and claim 28 depends from claim 27. Hence, these dependent claims also are believed to be in condition for allowance.

* * * * *

The Office Action requires affirmation of the election made by Applicants during the March 10, 2005 telephone conversation between the Examiner and Applicants' undersigned representative. Applicants hereby affirm the election of Group I.

* * * * *

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 17, 18, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as purportedly anticipated by Hasegawa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,276). The Office Action asserts Hasegawa discloses each feature of the listed claims. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 will be discussed as exemplary of all rejected independent claims. Claim 1 concerns a scanner system that includes an image scanner for scanning an image of an original and a control device for controlling the image scanner. The control device includes a first setting means accepting operator manual input for setting a reading size of the original, and a second setting means accepting operator manual input for setting a direction of the image of the original. Hence, according to claim 1, both the first and second setting means accept operator manual input. Applicants' exemplary, preferred embodiments exhibit such setting means structure in, for example, Fig. 4 and corresponding text at page 21, lines 7-21. As shown and discussed, in addition to "automatic" and "regular" size modes, the image reading size setting means has a "custom" mode that allows the user to arbitrarily set the user the reading size length and width. As for the original direction setting means 502, it offers the user selection capability of any of multiple combination patterns such as orientations 503, 504, 505, and 506 depicted in Fig. 4. Independent claims 10, 17, and 24 also have been amended to recite these patentable features of the first and second setting means.

Hasegawa discloses a digital copying machine 1 including a control unit 2 and an image reading unit 3. The image reading unit 3 sends image data to an image processing unit 4, in response to an instruction from control unit 2. Meanwhile, image reading unit 3 is provided with three original document size detect sensors 81-83. The CPU of image reading unit 3 determines the size of the original placed on contact glass 21, based on the combination of output signals from the three detect sensors 81-83. The CPU then outputs a feedback signal to the control unit 2 to inform the control unit of the document size. Hasegawa also indicates that the system control unit sets limits of the effective area for

preliminary scanning motion conducted by the image reading unit 3, in accordance with the size of the original, based on the feedback signals from the size detect sensors 81-83.

Unlike the present invention, Hasegawa teaches that detection of the original document's size automatically in the image reading unit 3 by information from the three document size detect sensors 81-83. To those of ordinary skill in the art then, Hasegawa does not teach or suggest a system control device that in any way accepts manual input from an operator. In Hasegawa's arrangement, the operator plays no role in setting a reading size for the original, or a direction for an image of the original.

Thus Hasegawa is completely different from Applicants' claimed invention which encourages the operator to manually set a reading size of the original, as well as a direction of the image of the original. In Hasegawa's arrangement, the CPU image reading unit does not determine the direction of an image carried on the original document, but only determines the size and direction of the original document. Therefore, in Hasegawa's machine, one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the operator cannot manually set a reading size or direction of the original image. Hence, Hasegawa fails to disclose each and every feature of each of the independent claims and thus cannot anticipate the claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit this rejection is overcome and request it be withdrawn.

* * *

Claims 3, 12, 19, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly obvious based on Hasegawa in view of Frederiksen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,859,287). Applicants also respectfully traverse this rejection.

The deficiencies of Hasegawa are described above, Frederiksen fails to remedy these deficiencies. Neither patent teaches or fairly suggests a control device that includes a first setting means for accepting operator manual input for setting a reading size of the original, and a second setting means for accepting operator manual input for setting a direction of the image of the original. Moreover, there is nothing in the combined teachings of these two patents which would have motivated those of ordinary skill to have employed these features. Hence, this rejection also is overcome and its withdrawal also is requested.


* * * * *

Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment and the above remarks obviate the outstanding objection and rejections in this case, thereby placing the application in condition for immediate allowance. Allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

If any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 032739.008.

If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is necessary that is not accounted for in the papers filed herewith, such an extension is requested. The extension fee should be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 032739.008

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 
Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202)263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: June 20, 2005

MAM/BLN/cvj